



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XXI.—THE DATING OF SKELTON'S SATIRES

Satires are of two general types. Those in which the general characteristics of humanity are subjected to ridicule, and those in which the attack is directed at specific individuals and definite events. The first, since humanity has not greatly changed thru the centuries, always retains about the same amount of interest. Nor is it ever much resented because, as Swift says, "satire, being levelled at all, is never resented for any offense by any, since every individual person makes bold to understand it of others, and very wisely removes his particular part of the burden upon the shoulders of the world, which are broad enough, and able to bear it." This however by no means applies to satire of the second type. There the contemporaneous interest, heightened by the excitement of the knowledge of the persons or the events, is purchased at the expense of posterity enlightened only by a depressing foot-note. Unhappily it is to the second class that Skelton's satires belong. In his lifetime he was palpitatingly alive; as is shown by Hall, his epigrams were on everyone's lips, and even before his death, as in Rastall's *Hundred Mery Talys* (1526), he was a celebrated character; today his satires are like old riddles the answer to which has been forgotten. The reason for this condition is not only that he dared not, or cared not, to be too plain, but also that, owing to an absence of dates, we cannot be sure exactly to what period his allusions refer. The earliest editions that we have, altho undated, are at least twenty years after his death. This may be because all the copies of the early editions have perished, or because, as he himself intimates in *Colin Clout* (1239-41), no early

editions were allowed to be printed. A second result arising from this condition is that equally we can never be sure of his text. Consequently his satires, at times apparently intelligible, are yet as a whole hopelessly confused.

To solve the riddle, the first object obviously should be to determine the dates of the major satires. Of these there are five in the order given by Dyce's edition: *A replycacion agaynst certayne yong scolers abiured of late &c*, *Colyn Clout*, *Speke*, *Parrot*, *Why come ye nat to court*, and *How the doughty Duke of Albany*, &c. Almost the sole external evidence consists in the enumeration of his works in the *Garland of Laurel*, an edition of which bears the colophon, *Inpryntyd by me Rycharde faukes . . . The yere of our lorde god .M.CCCCC.XXIII. The .iii. day of October*. It is customary to divide these poems into two classes, those (named in the *Garland*) composed before 1523, and those not, composed after 1523. From internal evidence based on the use of recurrent rhyme, repetition, and alliteration, Brie¹ ranks them in the following order: *Colin Clout*, *Why Come*, *Albany*, and the *Replycacion*. The change in putting the *Replycacion* last instead of first he supports by showing that there is a definite allusion in the poem to an event in 1527. This order is accepted *faute de mieux* by Koelbing.² Thus the case rests.

But it is the belief of the present writer that the poems may be much more definitely dated from the allusions. The assumption must first be made, as Skelton himself states repeatedly, that the poems mean something definite. But this meaning in accordance with the custom of the time was veiled in "couvert terms." Still more, he used cryp-

¹ Friedrich Brie, *Skelton-Studien, Englische Studien*, Band XXXVII, p. 46.

² Arthur Koelbing, *Cambridge History*, vol. III, chapter IV.

tograms in *Ware the Hawke* and in the *Garland*. Yet, to explain his contemporary reputation, at the time, to one familiar with the situation, the poems must have been comparatively clear. And Skelton's position must be remembered. In the Skelton of the apocryphal *Merie Tales* we have lost the real Skelton, chosen to be tutor to a prince of the blood royal, praised by Erasmus for his learning, and patronized by the great house of Howard. At the date of the composition of these poems, he must by any computation have been passed middle life. Naturally, then, in the affairs of both Church and State he is conservative, resenting the new order brought in by Wolsey. And yet he is always intensely loyal to the King. It is on Wolsey, in whose grasp are the affairs of both Church and State, that he, as a Churchman of the old school and as a protégé of the old nobility, pours forth his scorn.

This is first shown in *Speke, Parrot*, "which would require the scholia of a Tzetzes to render it intelligible."³ The peculiarity of this poem is that it seems divided into separate sections, each with its own date, "Penultimo die Octobris, 33°," "In diebus Novembris, 34," "15 kalendis Decembris, 34," "34," etc. These figures have been abandoned as meaningless, as in 1533 Skelton was dead. On the other hand, since for years Skelton had been an official in the court of Henry VII and as such must have dated all his formal documents from the accession of the king, it seems probable that for reasons of sentiment or purpose of concealment, even in the reign of Henry VIII he continued the custom. As Henry Richmond became king at the battle of Bosworth Field, August 22nd, 1485, "penultimo die Octobris, 33°" is simply October 30th, 1517, etc. This assumption, altho the method of dating

³ Dyce, vol. I, p. xliii.

is unprecedented, is not extreme in the case of an author that substitutes figures for letters or makes nonsense Latin by transposing his syllables, as he does in the passage in the *Garland*.⁴ A suggestive coincidence may be found that a previous entry in the manuscript book (Harl. ms. 2252) is dated 1517.⁵ The problem then is merely to locate the events upon the dates thus given, and the poem proves to be a running commentary of those years.⁶ The only possible proof that this is the correct solution is that now the poems make sense. If this be true, it follows that the *Decastichon Virulentum in Galeratum Lycaonta Marinum, etc.*,⁷ at present attached to the end of the *Why Come* with the numeral "xxxiiii" should be transferred to the *Speke, Parrot* group. This is inherently probable, as we find the same expressions, "Lycaon," "vitulus," "Oreb," "Salmane," "Zeb," etc., used in both poems. These passages are not like the previous *Why Come* and they are very like the jargon used in *Speke, Parrot*; read in connection with the first they are unintelligible, while read in connection with the second they make sense. The probability is that in some manuscripts they became confused.

The importance of this interpretation is that it gives a conception of Skelton's manner of composition. The poems were not written at a single sitting. Apparently he wrote a section, waited months, then continued with little indication of a break. Apparently during these years he must have had some relation with the Court, as his poems *Agaynst Garnyssche* are indorsed "By the King's commandment."⁸ This would explain his attack against Wol-

⁴ Dyce, I, p. 163.

⁵ Dyce, II, p. 345.

⁶ For a detailed interpretation of the poem the reader is referred to a forthcoming article in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vol. xxx (1915).

⁷ Brie, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

⁸ Brie, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

sey as a statesman in *Why Come*. The first definite date is to be found in the lines (72-74)

Treatinge of trewse restlesse,
Pratyng for peace peaselesse.
The countrynge at Cales
Wrang us on the males.

This must refer to Wolsey's expedition to Calais, July-November, 1521, as mediator between Francis and Charles. But in l. 122 et seq., he objects to the policy toward the Scots.

We have cast vp our war,
And made a worthy trewse (137-8)

refers to the truce between Lord Dacre and Albany, September 11, 1522.

Yet the good Erle of Surray,
The Frenche men he doth fray (150-1)

alludes to the expedition led by Surrey, July 29, 1522, against the French coast. As he does not however know that Surrey will be appointed lieutenant-general of the army against the Scots, February 26th, 1523, the passage must have been written in the fall of 1522. And as it alludes to Thomas Manners, Lord Ros, it must have been in October of that year, as by October 31st Dacre is suggesting to Wolsey his recall.⁹ Again the allusion, somewhat mysterious, to Montreuil (374) seems to refer to suspicions during the early autumn that a French fleet was collecting there for an invasion of England. But lines 782-835 unexpectedly accuse John Meautis (the King's French secretary) of treachery. The poem states

⁹ All these dates are taken from the *Calendar of State Papers*, Part 3.

that he is gone. This must be later than March 15th, 1523, as on that date is the patent for Brian Tuke: "To be secretary for the French tongue, *vice* John Meauties, with 100 marks a year." Here then are the extremes. The poem was written in parcels varying from the fall of 1521 to the spring of 1523.¹⁰

The poem on the retreat of the Duke of Albany, like the earlier celebration over the Battle of Flodden, seems to have been written immediately on the receipt of the news. As the retreat may be dated November 2nd, 1523, that poem may be placed toward the end of that year.

Such poems as these, where the allusions are to definite events, require only a detailed knowledge of the *Calendar of Letters and State Papers* to be correctly dated. It is merely a question of selecting the proper events, and, since many of the references are unmistakable, the chance of error is not very great. And in each case the limit of the time of composition is within two years. Unhappily this does not apply to the next poem on the list, *Colin Clout*. This is the best known of his poems, perhaps, because the name was adopted by Spenser. Another obvious reason is that as the references are to a general condition, they are more generally intelligible. But this very fact increases the difficulty in the dating. As with *Speke, Parrot*, *Colin Clout* is mentioned in the *Garland*, the conclusion seems apparently inevitable that it was written before October 3rd, 1523, altho how much before is matter for conjecture. Therefore Brie¹¹ bounds the date of composition by 1521, and owing to the mention of Luther, at the other extreme by 1518. In this connection, consequently, it is necessary to consider the phrasing in the

¹⁰ Brie, *op. cit.*, shows that v. 905 is an allusion to the mayoralty of Sir John Mundy, who became mayor October 28th, 1522.

¹¹ Brie, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

Garland. Under Henry VIII the open expression of political opinion was unsafe. That in the avowed list of his writing Skelton should intrude upon public notice poems in which he attacked the powerful minister of the King seems almost incredible. Yet in the *Garland* he mentions,

Item the Popingay, that hath in commendacyoun
Ladyes and gentylwomen suche as deseruyd,
And suche as be counterfettis they be reseruyd.

To make his meaning perfectly clear, a side note is added: "Fac cum concilio, et in aeternum non peccabis; Salamon"! This must refer to *Speke, Parrot*, that has the verse (280):

Go, litell quayre, namyd the Popagay.

On the other hand, unless he had written two poems both called the Popingay, *Speke, Parrot* by no possible construction can be taken to refer to ladies of any kind. The unavoidable inference is that, feeling that he has gone too far, he deliberately suggests a wrong interpretation. But there is no misinterpretation possible in *Why Come*. It is an open attack upon Wolsey and his policy. Therefore he omits all mention of it, merely remarking that the list is not complete. *Colin Clout*, on the contrary, is mentioned by name:

Also the Tunnyngye of Elinour Rummyng,
With Colyn Clowt, Iohnn Iue, with Ioforth Iack;
To make suche trifels it asketh sum konnyng,
In honest myrth parde requyreth no lack;
And after cuenyauns as the world goos,
It is no foly to vse the Walshemannys hoos.

The side notes are: "Quis stabit mecum adversus operantes inquitatem? Pso. Arrident melius seria picta jocis: In fabulis Aesopi." In other words, he does not

feel it necessary to veil his meaning as in *Speke, Parrot* nor to omit it as in *Why Come*. The assumption is that there is nothing in the poem that would offend any particular individual. Therefore it is classified with *Elinour Rumming*, where general satire is used for "honest mirth."

Yet tradition asserts that the satire in *Colin Clout* is not general, but particular, and that it is directed against Wolsey. The tale is told by Francis Thynne in his *Animadversions*:¹²

. . . . whereupon the kinge bydd hym goo his waye, and feare not. All whiche not withstandinge, my father was called in question by the Bysshoppes, and heaved at by Cardinall Wolsey, his olde enymye for manye causes, but mostly for that my father had furthered Skelton to publishe his 'Collen Cloute' againste the Cardinall, the moste parte of whiche Booke was compiled in my fathers howse at Erithe in Kente.

Francis Thynne's memory has played him false in stating that *Colin Clout* was composed at Erith, because his father did not buy the house there until two years after Skelton's death. This confusion is immaterial, since it involves only the date of the purchase of the Erith house. As Thynne was born there fifteen years later, to him it was the home of his father from time immemorial. Yet the fact of the conflict of the elder Thynne with the Cardinal, together with the reason for that conflict, would be preserved in the family memory. Therefore unless Skelton had written two poems while staying with Thynne senior, and the son confused them,—an hypothesis that seems quite unwarranted,—*Colin Clout* must be considered as directed against Wolsey. This is confirmed by the fact that among the Lansdown MSS. (762. fol. 75),¹³ lines 462-

¹² *Francis Thynne's Animadversions upon Speght's first* (1598 A. D.) *Edition of Chaucer's Workes*, Chaucer Society, 1875, p. 10.

¹³ Quoted by Dyce, I, p. 329.

480 of *Colin Clout* are given as an independent poem, endorsed "The profecy of Skelton, 1529." And this passage, prophesying

A fatall fall of one
That shuld syt on a trone,
And rule all thynges alone. . .

must refer to Wolsey.

An independent testimony that in *Colin Clout* Skelton aims at Wolsey is afforded by William Bullein.¹⁴ In 1564, if not earlier,¹⁵ he wrote a *Dialogue against the Feuer Pestilence*, in which amongst others, he thus mentions Skelton:

Skelton satte in the corner of a Piller with a Frostie bitten face, frownyng, and is scante yet cooled of the hotte burnyng Cholour kindeled againste the cankered Cardinall Wolsey; wrytyng many sharpe *Disticchons* with bloudie penne againste hym, and sente them by the infernal riuers *Styx*, *Flegiton*, and *Acheron* by the Feriman of helle, called *Charon*, to the saied Cardinall.

How the Cardinall came of nought,
And his Prelacie solde and bought;
And where suche Prelates bee
Sprong of lowe degree,
And spirituall dignitee,
Farewell benignitee,
Farewell simplicitee,
Farewell good charitee!

Thus paruum literatus
Came from Rome gatus,
Doctour dowpatus,
Scante a Bacheloratus:

And thus Skelton did ende
With Wolsey his frende.

These fourteen lines, with of course the exception of the final couplet, are made up of two separate passages from

¹⁴ Early English Text Society, Extra Series, LII, p. 16.

¹⁵ The earliest edition reads "newly corrected."

Colin Clout, vs. 585-594 and vs. 797-802. But in the Dyce the reading differs. The first couplet is

Howe prelacy is solde and bought,
And come up of nought.

And the second passage reads:

But doctour Bullatus,
Parum litteratus,
At the brode gatus
Doctour Daupatus. . . .

Neither has any reference to Wolsey. As is evidenced by this and the "Profecy," *Colin Clout* circulated in fragments where the satire was more open.

And the internal evidence tells the same tale. It is hard to understand such lines as (990-1006)

It is a besy thyng
For one man to rule a kyng
Alone and make rekenyng,
To gouerne ouer all
And rule a realme royall
By one mannes verrey wyt; . . .
For I rede a preposycyon,
Cum regibus amicare,
Et omnibus dominari,
Et supra te pravare;
Wherefore he hathe good ure
That can hymselfe assure
How fortune wyll endure

in any other sense than as an attack upon Wolsey. Altho Kele's edition reads "ging" (obs. a crowd), the Latin lines make the allusion almost as pointed. Some of *Colin Clout* certainly was read as an attack upon Wolsey.

If the reasoning up to this point has been accurate, it follows that one version of the poem was written previous to the composition of the *Garland*, namely, the portions in which Skelton objects to the conditions of the Church

in general, and that, as he did in *Speke, Parrot*, upon this he grafted other portions definitely aimed at Wolsey. The present problem is by detecting the Wolsey additions to date the final composition of the poem. The first 160 lines purport to give the common criticism against the Church. Then follows a passage (162-185) in which the clergy are urged to remember the example of St. Thomas à Becket,

*Thomas manum mittit ad fortia,
Spernit damna, spernit opprobria,
Nulla Thomam frangit injuria.*

But as St. Thomas was killed defending the rights of the Church against the secular power, the passage, to be appropriate, must refer to a similar conflict. The occasion is found in the events of 1523. The clergy of the Convocation, summoned by the Archbishop of Canterbury, were on the first day of the meeting in St. Paul's cited to appear before Wolsey by virtue of his legatine authority. And, after a protest, on the 2nd of June they voted a tax "being no less than fifty per cent. income tax, to be paid by installments in five years."¹⁶ Great was the indignation of the clergy over this assertion of the legatine power by Wolsey, "whiche was never sene before in England, wherof master Skelton, a mery Poet wrote

Gentle Paule laie doune thy swearde:
For Peter of Westminster hath shaven thy beard."¹⁷

As Skelton, as we know from *Albany*, considered the war mismanaged, this wholesale appropriation of church property naturally caused him to protest.

Lines 376-438 show how religious men and nuns are

¹⁶ Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII*, I, p. 494.

¹⁷ Hall's *King Henry the VIII*, ed. by Charles Whibley, I, p. 287.

turned from their houses and forced to wander. The religious establishments are torn down, the leads and bells sold, and the property confiscated, to the detriment of the souls of the founders.

What coulde the Turke do more
 With all his false lore,
 Turke, Sarazyn, or Jew?
 I reporte me to you,
 O mercyful Jesu,
 You supporte and resuce,
 My style for to dyrecte,
 It may take some effecte!

In 1524 Wolsey procured from Clement VII bulls to enable him to found Cardinal College at Oxford and to endow it by the suppression of a number of small monasteries. "The dissolution of these monasteries, however, small as they were, was not liked in the country; and at Bayham, a Premonstratensian house in Sussex, the country people, disguising themselves, put the canons in again for a time—an outrage which, of course, was duly punished."¹⁸ *Colin Clout*, here, is merely echoing popular sentiment.

Still more curious is the passage 936-981. Here the bishops are accused of

Buylding royally
 Theyr mancyons suryously,
 With turrettes and with toures,
 With halles and with boures,
 Stretchynge to the starres,
 With glasse wyndowes and barres.

Of course the only bishop that might be said to be building "royally" is Wolsey with Hampton Court—an edifice

¹⁸ James Gairdner, *The English Church*, p. 81.

that suits the description. Within, the building is hung with tapestry described in lines 942-973:

Hangynge aboute the walles
Clothes of golde and palles,
Arras of ryche aray,
Fresshe as flours in May;
Wyth dame Dyana naked;
Howe lusty Venus quaked,
And howe Cupyde shaken
His dart, and bent his bowe
For to shote a crowe
At her tyrly tyrlowe;
And howe Parys of Troy
Daunced a lege de moy,
Made lusty sporte and ioy
With dame Helyn the quene;
With suche storyes bydene
Their chambres well besene;
With triumphes of Cesar,
And of Pompeyus war,
Of renowne and of fame
By them to get a name:
Nowe all the worlde stares,
How they ryde in goodly chares,
Conueyed by olyphantes,
With lauryat garlantes,
And by vnycornes
With their semely hornes;
Vpon these beestes rydyng,
Naked bodyes strydyng,
With wanton wenches winkyng.
Nowe truly, to my thynkyng,
That is a speculacyon
And a mete meditacyon
For prelates of estate, . . .

These lines apparently describe, as was pointed out by Ernest Law,¹⁹ a definite set of tapestries at Hampton

¹⁹ *A History of Hampton Court Palace*, 2nd ed. 1890, I, pp. 64-65.
As sketches of the designs are here given, the reader may see for

Court. "Of these six triumphs (Wolsey having duplicates of those of Time and Eternity), we at once identify three, namely, those of Death, Renown, and Time, as still remaining at Hampton Court in Henry VIII's Great Watching or Guard Chamber; while the other three—of Love, Chastity, and Eternity, or Divinity,—complete the set of six designs, which were illustrative, in an allegorical form, of Petrarch's Triumphs. . . . In each piece a female, emblematic of the influence whose triumph is celebrated, is shown enthroned on a gorgeously magnificent car drawn by elephants, or unicorns, or bulls, richly caparisoned and decorated; while around them throng a host of attendants and historical personages, typical of the triumph portrayed. Thus, in the Triumph of Fame or Renown, we have figures representing Julius Cæsar and Pompey; and in the first aspect of the Triumph of Chastity we see Venus, driven by naked cupids, and surrounded by heroines of amorous renowned, attacked by Chastity. The reader will now recognize how pointed is the reference to these tapestries in the following lines of Skelton's satire. . . ." Unless there chanced to be in England and familiar to Skelton another set of tapestries allegorically representing Petrarch's triumphs—an hypothesis that does not seem probable—Skelton's lines refer to these. But these appear in Wolsey's inventory as "hangings bought of the 'xecutors of my lord of Durham anno xiiiio Reg. H. viii." But as Ruthall, Bishop of Durham, died February 4, 1523, the passage is either an attack upon Ruthall, or the list in the *Garland* was written at the earliest only eight months before it was published by Hawkes. Neither alternative seems very probable.

himself the accuracy of Skelton's description. Mr. Law, however, gives no indication of the difficulty in the dating caused by his discovery.

Altho Ruthall caused to be built the great chamber at Bishop Aukland, the expression "royally" seems overdone to apply to that; nor does eight months' intermission between the composition of a poem and the publication of it seem in accordance with the leisurely methods of printing used in the 16th century. The simplest explanation of the difficulty, therefore, is the assumption that there were two versions of the poem. The first was a general attack upon ecclesiastical conditions, and as such was alluded to in the *Garland*. Skelton then added passages specifically attacking Wolsey, altho not by name. The result of this reticence was, however, that as of Wolsey alone could it be said (605-6),

And upon you ye take
To rule bothe kynge and kayser,

the 16th century read Wolsey into the whole poem, even into those parts that originally had no application to him. Consequently Wolsey was held up to ridicule as the type of the sensual luxury-loving prelate that sacrificed the needs of the Church to the demands of the State. And it is on this side that Wolsey's career cannot be defended.²⁰ Altho Wolsey's statesmanship, as revealed in the State Papers, may justify Brewer's enthusiasm, his sacrifice of the Church to the State explains the attitude of Skelton. This also explains why Wolsey could afford to overlook, provided that he ever saw it, the heavy personal invective and the attack upon his foreign policy in *Why Come*. The first was much exaggerated and the second misunderstood. And neither greatly interested the country at large. The personal vices of rulers in fact rather tend toward

²⁰ I do not understand why Bridgett in the *Life of Blessed Thomas More* and the Abbé Gasquet in *The Eve of the Reformation* should ignore the testimony of pre-Reformation writers.

enhancing their popularity by making them more human; and the average Englishman of the time had not the information at hand to enable him to discuss Wolsey's foreign policy. But when he saw the Church, a national institution that he loved, endangered, Skelton's protest was merely the expression of his own convictions. In that lies the power of the poem.

The obvious objection to the preceding dating of the poems and the consequent interpretation of them lies in the fact that in the Dyce are four pieces that state explicitly that they were written for Wolsey, *The Boke of Three Fooles*, *Lautre Enuoy* affixed to the *Garland*, an *Enuoy* affixed to *Albany*, and the dedication to the *Reply-cacion*. The dilemma is that after he had composed bitter attacks and while he was still composing them he also was apparently in most friendly relations with his enemy. The situation presupposes both a moral weakness on the part of the author and a general obtuseness on the part of the Cardinal. To avoid this inference, scholars have suggested a number of explanations, none of which is completely satisfactory.²¹ To attack the question anew, there needs must be a further analysis. Of the four cases mentioned above, where Skelton places himself under the protection of Wolsey, the first three group into one class. The passages referring to Wolsey appear for the first time in Marshe's edition of Skelton's works, in 1568, nearly forty years after Skelton's death. In this interval of transcription it would be reasonable to infer that errors should creep in. That this is actually the case is shown by Brie by indicating the *Boke of Three Fooles* as the work of Watson, a translator of Droyn's French prose

²¹ Brie, *op. cit.*, p. 13; Koelbing, *Zur Charakteristik John Skeltons*, p. 140; Thümmel, *Studien über John Skelton*, p. 44.

version of Locher's Latin version of Brant's *Narrenschiff*. As this was published in London in 1509, the passage in question is not by Skelton nor could his contemporaries have thought so. This gives a curious insight into Marshe's critical ability. Of the other two, it is worth comment that the original edition of the *Garland*, 1523, has no such envoy to the Cardinal. Therefore until these are shown to be the work of Skelton, it seems rather a waste of time to discuss them.

This does not apply, however, to the dedication to the *Replycacion*. This was printed by Pynson, who died in 1530. It is therefore practically contemporaneous. The poem itself, by the allusion to the punishment of the Cambridge scholars, Thomas Bilney and Thomas Arthur, must be dated as late as 1527. As the latest possible date of publication is so near the latest possible date of composition, there is little margin of time for error to occur. Consequently the inference seems unavoidable that the dedication to Wolsey in this case is genuine. The probable explanation seems to have been found by Mr. SeBoyar,²² who found in this report of the visitation of Bishop Nicke to the Cathedral of Norwich, 1526, that a Dominus Johannes Shelton had been accused of *gravia crimina et nephanda peccata*. The identification of this Shelton with the poet, whose name was sometimes spelled so, seems plausible. Skelton, who traditionally had had trouble with Bishop Nicke, finding himself accused, turned even to his old enemy, the all-powerful minister. But this assumes that Wolsey had not understood *Speke, Parrot*, or seen *Why Come*. Probably, therefore, they were circulating in manuscript. This also justifies the very late dating of *Colin Clout*. When this came into Wolsey's

²² *Modern Language Notes*, December, 1913.

hands, he naturally enough refused his aid to Skelton, who therefore took refuge with Islip in the sanctuary of Westminster. Thus, while this is entirely inferential, it is also plausible.

The dating of the five satires then is as follows:

<i>Speke, Parrot</i>	1517-18.
<i>Decastichon</i> , et al.	1518.
<i>Why Come Ye not to Court?</i>	1521-1523.
<i>Duke of Albany</i>	The end of 1523.
<i>Colin Clout</i>	?—1524-5.
<i>Replycacion</i>	1527.

JOHN M. BERDAN.